# REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH PLANNING COMMISSION 15 MARCH 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Lawrence called the meeting to order at 7:53 PM.

## 2. ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Ms. Hockenberry

Mr. Kearnev Mr. Lawrence Mr. Meeks Ms. Rodgers Ms. Teates Mr. Wodiska

Administrative Staff Present: Ms. Cotellessa, General Manager of Development

Services and Planning Director

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: Ms. Teates moved, and Ms. Hockenberry seconded, to adopt the Agenda as presented. The motion passed on voice vote.

## 4. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

Ms. Teates reported that construction had recommenced at the BJ's site. Ms. Hockenberry affirmed that she had also observed work being done at that location.

5. RECEIPT OF PETITIONS: None.

### 6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Ms. Cotellessa noted that a list of upcoming calendar events had been provided in Commissioners's packages. BJ's Warehouse is anticipated to open in August 2010, as noted in the Monthly Report that was also in the Commission's package. She reported that the Zoning Ordinance Advisory Committee (ZOAC) had discussed parking, parking ratios, and nonconforming lots at its last meeting.

In response to questions from Commissioners, Ms. Cotellessa replied that the joint City Council and Planning Commission worksession scheduled for April 12 would be to discuss both the site plan and the subdivision applications for The Wilden (350 South Washington Street) and for 360 South Washington Street; that the West End Park minor site plan amendment would not return to the Planning Commission for review; and that the Board of Zoning Appeals had approved special use permits for

both a drive-through for BB&T Bank at West Falls Plaza and a group home for Courtney's House at its March meeting. The Planning Commission will review and approve the BB&T site plan when it is available.

### 7. OLD BUSINESS:

B. (TR10-09) Resolution To Grant A Special Exception For Residential Development Within Mixed Use Projects Under Section 48-90 In A B-2, Central Business District On .64 Acres Of Land Located At 350 South Washington Street [FCHC Wilden]. The applicant proposes to develop this project in a joint site plan with a commercial development and parking structure at 360 South Washington Street on .62 acres of land, with a concurrent subdivision to adjust lot lines between the properties.

Ms. Cotellessa reported that the Commission had held several worksessions on this proposal and had received a summary update in its package. Since the original submission, the applicant has, at the request of the City Council, brought the adjacent property at 360 South Washington Street into the development scheme. Working with the owner and the contract purchaser of that property, the applicant has made the following significant changes to the original submission:

- provided for structured parking for The Wilden at the adjacent site (38 spaces);
- 2. revised the building plans for The Wilden as six-story building instead of a four-story building;
- 3. proposed the development of a three-story office building and additional structured parking at 360 South Washington Street to further the mixed use environment of the original office development (This development will request at site plan two additional minor waivers to landscape planting requirements to accommodate storm sewers and pedestrian paths.);
- 4. worked with the adjacent property owners at 360 and 370 South Washington Street to address ingress/egress issues, construction and infrastructure easements, and improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and
- provided a resubdivision scenario that includes an improved development site for 360 South Washington Street and facilities joint development of structured parking.

If this Special Exception is approved, the site plan will be revised to include improving pedestrian circulation to include convenient and workable paths from The Wilden to public transportation on South Washington Street through the 360 South Washington Street property; modifying the architecture of the buildings at 350 and at 360 South Washington Street to address Architectural Advisory Board (AAB) and Planning Commission comments; lighting to provide a good pedestrian environment

in the evenings; a welcoming façade and entry to The Wilden; modifying the street edges along South Maple Avenue, East Fairfax Street, and South Washington Street to provide better defined streetscapes and public spaces, as well as convenient transit or alternative transportation mode access; and considering additional improvements in the East Fairfax Street right-of-way.

Ms. Cotellessa stated that the project proposed is improved with the addition of the adjacent site, a lot line adjustment, and the potential for commercial office development. It is critical that the off-site structured parking for The Wilden be completed prior to occupancy of The Wilden. Draft language for ensuring the required connection was provided in the staff report. The staff report also included a letter from Homestretch, owner of 370 South Washington Street, in support of the project.

Ms. Cotellessa directed attention to items provided to the Commission this evening: a letter from the City's Housing Commission in support of The Wilden project; minutes from the City's Human Services Advisory Council (HSAC) that indicate its support for the project; and comments from Mike Novotny, who is also a member of the City's Economic Development Authority. She summarized Mr. Novotny's comments, as follows: recommended not to approve the various resolutions being considered for The Wilden; and beginning a larger planning effort for the South Washington Street corridor that reinforces the current planning for commercial uses in this area. Based on a discussion with Mr. Young, construction of the office building may be deferred or not built at all. While the intentions of Mr. Young are good, there is risk that a pre-lease tenant is not found and the office component is either placed "on-hold" or ultimately may not be built. Mr. Young reportedly will have an agreement in place compelling him to build the garage for the applicant, so what happens afterwards if there is no pre-lease, no office building, and Mr. Young finds himself unable to support the project economically? Mr. Novotny stated that some have justified The Wilden project based on the idea that "it's better than what's there now", but this kind of comparison falls far short of encouraging the City to maximize its commercial space, and could be used to justify almost any new project. Rather, the comparison should be against how the City expects the land to perform in the future. Additional justification is cited that "development begets development", however not all construction is created equal, and this project does not produce the kinds of synergies that would encourage other high-quality commercial development. In fact, it specifically prevents lot consolidation and higher-quality commercial development on the 350 South Washington Street parcel. The new office building proposed for 360 South Washington Street could help, but the building size will be substandard and the plan fails to consolidate adjacent parcels, so it's unclear whether this component encourages or limits future higherquality commercial development. Mr. Novotny had provided a financial analysis spreadsheet for the Commission's consideration. His comments stated that TR10-14

proposes a "pay when you can approach" for the applicant stating that annual payments would be made only when the applicant has available cash flow. As a result, the City's actual annual debt service would be between \$290K and \$220K annually for the entire 15 years; and TO10-14 further states the City will be last in line (9<sup>th</sup> out of a total 9 stakeholders) to get paid, placing even the equity holders ahead of the City and shifting the full risk of nonpayment to the City.

Ms. Cotellessa noted that the applicant had provided new elevation drawings, dated March 15, 2010, which were provided to the Commission this evening. She advised that she had not had an opportunity to review the drawings.

Chair Lawrence observed that the HSAC minutes provided this evening did not appear to support the project proposed, but instead listed its concerns and questions. Questions discussed by the HSAC at its meeting included the long term plans for Winter Hill, the appearance of an insufficient number of parking spaces for independent seniors; inquired who would pay for the (construction of) the parking spaces, and whether there were occupancy assumptions on the 360 South Washington Street building. The HSAC expressed concerns about timing, cost, and location while expressing a general support for affordable housing and stated that perhaps the money being used for this project might better serve other human service needs. The HSAC forward the following questions to the Assistant City Manager following its meeting:

- 1. Can you define all the community/common areas in the building e.g. meeting spaces, storage?
- 2. Can you define all the parking spaces FCHC office, office building, residential, evening/day use?
- 3. If the 38 (parking) spaces should prove to be inadequate, are there triggers or opportunities to increase the number of spaces?
- 4. Do the positive revenue numbers for 360 assume full occupancy? What is the effect of less than full occupancy on those numbers? And
- 5. If the office building is constructed post construction of the senior building what are the scenarios for each year of delay?

David Lasso, of the Venable law firm, representing the Falls Church Housing Corporation and The Community Builders (TCB), introduced Carol Jackson, Executive Director of the Falls Church Housing Corporation; Jay Wilson, of Wiencek + Associates, the architect on The Wilden project; Karen Steen, an engineer with Walter L. Phillips, Inc.; and noted that Jack Wilson, an architect with Butz Wilburn, who would arrive later in the evening. Mr. Lasso noted that the Falls Church Housing Corporation (FCHC) was created by the City nearly 30 years ago with the express purpose of providing housing for the disadvantaged. A former garden apartment development, Tyler Gardens, was converted to condominiums and several units were purchased by the FCHC for low income persons and FCHC has

been seeking affordable housing ever since. Mr. Lasso expressed his understanding of the cost of this project to the community, but advised that everybody is investing in this project. He reflected on the efforts of local jurisdictions to provide affordable housing to their citizens. The size of the City creates an impediment for locating sites for affordable housing. The federal grant funding awarded for senior housing in this project will be leveraged for an important project. He reviewed previous, unsuccessful, efforts to provide a stand alone facility and reported how many people have worked together to make this project successful on a core value of this community. Mr. Lasso agreed that the use proposed would not have the highest economic return, but the site would be improved with a new building that would spur development on surrounding properties.

Mr. Wilson apologized for the lateness of the elevation drawings provided this evening, but advised that the team had been working hard to address comments received previously. He provided an overview of changes made. The commercial space has been maximized, the building has been increased in height, the elevation will step back at the second and at the fifth floors, green roofs will be provided on each roof, the corridor at the back of the building was opened and includes a seating area, the corner of South Maple Avenue and East Fairfax Street have been expanded to a dramatic building corner, and an angled canopy will be provided over the storefront area which then flows into the residential area. Work has been done to have the buildings at 350 and at 360 South Washington Street coordinate and compliment one another. Similar perforated signboards will be used at both buildings. The 350 South Washington Street building will have transparent glass walls at both corners at the Maple Avenue/Fairfax Street intersection. A small atrium area will be provided on each floor. Classic 'Falls Church style' red brick, grey brick, and beige party panel will be used on the exterior in response to previous comments.

Mr. Wilson advised that Mr. Wilburn would discuss the 360 South Washington Street building, but wanted to note that the loading dock of The Wilden building would face East Fairfax Street. A variety of sectional garage doors had been considered for the loading dock and it was decided to use a door with translucent glass panels that will be setback from the building's façade. Mr. Lasso advised that Mr. Wilburn was enroute to the meeting.

Mr. Kearney thanked the applicants for listening to comments concerning the building's appearance – the street is better addressed, the facades have improved, and the colors are better. However, he still had heartburn with the retail corner. In response to questions, Mr. Wilson stated that the driveway would be asphalt, but that the loading zone and an area at the back of the building would be concrete with brick pavers for pedestrian crossings; there will not be a structure between the two buildings, it will be open air; and noted that a grade change necessitated using

some steps for the public access, but that a fence would preclude entrance to the private courtyard. The pathways will be lit, but no curb and gutter improvement is planned for the far side of East Fairfax Street. Mr. Kearney asked why the improvement was not included as it had been requested several times. Mr. Wilson advised that he could not speak to that.

Ms. Rodgers expressed pleasure with the newly added walkway and inquired how the 38 parking spaces in the parking structure would be accessed given the different topography between the two sites. Mr. Wilson stated that the lower parking level would be slightly underground and that an elevator would be installed with three stops: the lower parking level; the ground level; and the second parking level. In the resident drop-off and parking areas at the back of the 350 South Washington Street building both ramps and steps would be provided; the steps would only be two or three per location.

Chair Lawrence inquired about the location of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces; Ms. Steen indicated that those spaces would be located three to four feet below grade level, on the lower parking deck. Ms. Cotellessa advised that all ADA parking spaces could be reached by sloped surfaces (ramps) and by elevator. In response to Ms. Hockenberry's question, Mr. Wilson advised that the private patio would be accessed from the 350 building; not from the back of the building.

Mr. Wodiska agreed with Mr. Kearney and stated that the many of the changes shown tonight are very nice. He stated that additions include red brick, a new pathway, lights, and an angled canopy. He asked what the extra costs would be and the financial impact on the project. Mr. Wilson replied that the team was working with the contractor concerning the costs. In response to Mr. Wodiska's inquiry, Ms. Jackson stated that the contingency funds were 10% for hard costs and another 10% for soft costs.

In response to Mr. Kearney's question, Mr. Wilson stated that design proposed did not create an accessible path to the bus stop on South Washington Street. Ms. Hockenberry expressed her opinion that the bus stop should be accessible from 350 South Washington Street. Mr. Kearney suggested that the curving planter shown could be replaced with a ramp to create accessibility. Ms. Hockenberry concurred that that was a good idea. In response to further questions from Mr. Kearney, Mr. Wilson advised that the three-level elevator discussed would provide access to the 38 dedicated parking spaces for The Wilden and that Butz Wilburn was proposing a second elevator from the lobby of the 360 South Washington Street building for the parking structure.

Ms. Teates expressed her preference for the new elevation drawings, particularly for the rear façade of the 350 building.

After Chair Lawrence's inquiry, Mr. Lasso advised that Mr. Wilburn was enroute. He noted that the Special Exception requested was only for the 350 South Washington Street property. There will be common site plan for the 350 and for the 360 South Washington Street properties and that the applicant's team will be able to go into greater detail at the time. He noted the staff report included sample motions. In the sample motion for the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the Special Exception, condition two makes clear that the construction and the ultimate occupancy of The Wilden is contingent upon having parking provided in the structure at 360 South Washington Street.

Mr. Lasso advised that the current owner of 360 South Washington Street, Mr. Sawner, was present this evening. Mr. Sawner has a contract with Mr. Young, the purchaser of the 360 South Washington Street property, but no action can be taken on The Wilden until all contractual agreements have been made for the 360 South Washington Street property and for the parking structure built to contain the 38 dedicated spaces required for The Wilden. Mr. Lasso stated that there is a very unusual condition in the financing language. The condition is that unless The Wilden is completed and occupied by December 31, 2011, then no grant financing is available and the funds must be repaid. This creates a risk to the applicant and to the investors if the parking structure with the required 38 offsite parking spaces is incomplete.

Mr. Lasso stated that the applicant team is working with staff to finalize language in the event that The Wilden is completed, but that the parking structure is behind schedule due to unforeseen events, and short term parking might be required. The investors have requested that condition four on the sample motion attachment be modified to avoid losing the tax credits and the investments. He requested the Planning Commission to support the motion to approve the Special Exception requested, to ask the City Council to support and to include language to permit short-term off-site parking if the garage is not completed for an unforeseen reason prior to The Wilden being ready for occupancy before the end of the 2011 calendar year. Mr. Lasso stated that the investors would not go forward with this project if condition four is not so modified. He concurred that this was unusual, but that it is necessary.

Mr. Meeks questioned whether modifying condition four would cancel condition two in the sample motions. Mr. Lasso advised that it would not; the modification to condition four simply acknowledges that the time period for construction of the required parking structure is known.

Ms. Cotellessa offered her mea culpa and stated that staff usually provides the list of conditions for approval to the applicant prior to releasing the staff report. She apologized for the oversight. However, in the rush to prepare the Commission's package for this meeting, staff had reflected in the sample motions what the applicant had indicated would occur on these sites. The applicant team notified staff today that the investors were concerned about the text of the conditions and requested a modification.

Ms. Teates noted that the Commission's review of a previous proposal for this site included the applicant's inability to find off-site parking within the required limits. She had felt more confident with condition four that off-site parking would be provided for this project.

Ms. Cotellessa advised that language concerning granting a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) was contained in both the Zoning Code and the Building Code, however the Code languages do not match exactly; there are no Code provisions for temporary off-site parking. She advised that there are mechanisms, such as used at The Spectrum, but that these temporary mechanisms may not meet the investor's needs. At the Spectrum, all of the required parking spaces were not available at the time that the residential units had been completed. In that case, the City granted a percentage of temporary COs equal to the percentage of completed parking spaces. A resolution for offsite parking for The Wilden has not been determined should the structured parking not be completed by the time that The Wilden is ready for occupancy. Ms. Cotellessa indicated that she was uncertain how this issue could be resolved.

In response to Ms. Teates's inquiry, Mr. Lasso suggested that the applicant team is moving so quickly that last minute investor concerns could not be resolved today. He suggested that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the Special Exception with language that would provide a safety valve to accommodate temporary off-site parking, if needed. The City Council and the City Manager could resolve how the required parking would be provided, and for what length of time, that would be agreeable to the investors.

Mr. Meeks appreciated the investor's position, but noted that the City is also an investor in the project proposed. He was concerned to hear this evening that the City might not obtain the office building at 360 South Washington Street, let alone the structured parking. Mr. Meeks asked if the investors would be comfortable with receiving life/safety permits, similar to The Spectrum, rather than provide for temporary off-site parking. Mr. Lasso replied that the answer is "no"; the investors need permanent occupancy permits in order to meet the tax credit laws. Ms. Jackson explained that this is the unique construct of tax credit compliance investing. The investors have stated that this is an unyielding condition. She

provided an example from Arlington County where all development terms had nearly not been met by year end and stated that tax credit financing is always based on a calendar year. The applicant team suggested language to the investors late today, but had received no response.

Mr. Meeks inquired what the City's risk would be if the building were incomplete or if COs had not been issued by December 31, 2011. Mr. Lasso stated that the building would be built, but might be empty if this issue is unresolved and the tax credits lost. Ms. Jackson stated that The Community Builders (TCB) guarantees that the building will be ready by the deadline. If the building is incomplete or if the structured parking was incomplete on December 31, 2011, then Community Builders would incur the loss of the tax credit, would have a reputation of an inability to meet deadlines, and would need to find additional funding to complete the project. She advised that neither the FCHC nor the City of Falls Church would assume a risk. Mr. Lasso stated that the investors had indicated that they would not move forward on the project unless this issue was resolved.

Mr. Wodiska asked if this meant that Falls Church would receive the affordable housing units proposed even if the construction and/or occupancy deadlines were not met. Mr. Lasso concurred, but stated that the tax credits would be lost and TCB would have to find additional financing, if possible. He stated that this situation could be avoided by including language concerning temporary off-site parking. Mr. Wodiska clarified that TCB was committing to providing 66 affordable housing units at that site regardless of what happened with the financing. Mr. Lasso stated that that was correct.

Chair Lawrence inquired what is the investors's risk if TCB is responsible for repayment of tax credits should the deadline be missed. Ms. Jackson stated that two properties are involved. TCB is putting together an investor project and takes the risk losing the tax credits if a deadline is not met. The investors are looking for a mechanism to protect their investment should the offsite parking not be completed on privately owned property by the occupancy deadline for The Wilden.

Mr. Kearney asked who owned the garage. Mr. Young replied that Jefferson One, LLC would own the garage. Mr. Kearney noted that the FCHC had previously proposed underground parking at its cost on its site. Mr. Young advised that FCHC would pay the hard and the soft costs up front for 38 parking spaces in the parking structure on his property. Mr. Kearney inquired if a portion of the garage could be built to meet the off-site parking requirements for The Wilden. Mr. Young agreed that mechanically those parking spaces could be constructed, but that it was not practical to do so. He stated that the parking would not be provided unless the office building is built and that he had been working to make the office building a hard reality.

Mr. Young advised that he had a letter of intent from Mr. Sawner to lease 15,000 square feet of space within the 360 South Washington Street building. He stated that he is fairly confident that the office building will have a sufficient commitment to make it happen. In response to Mr. Kearney's inquiry, Mr. Young stated that at least 50% of the building must be committed to leasing; Mr. Sawner's commitment was for 50% of the proposed structure.

Chair Lawrence asked if the parking structure would have any public parking spaces. He noted that the City's Economic Development Committee might seek \$1.2M in intermodal funding for such public parking spaces. Mr. Young advised that the City has not made a commitment toward financing a portion of the parking structure, but the EDC had been encouraging. Mr. Young hopes to have 23-26 parking spaces on a half-level that would always be open to the public. Ninety parking spaces will be provided for office uses by day that would be open to the public evenings and weekends.

Mr. Young reported that the applicant team has asked for \$1.2M in intermodal grant funding towards the construction of the parking garage. Ms. Mester stated that the City has no money for the 360 South Washington Street project at this time although Mr. Young has requested consideration for intermodal funding. She stated that there is nothing concerning that request before the Planning Commission at this time. If it is the applicant's intention to provide a half deck of public parking, a bus stop pull-over, bike facilities, zip cars, and/or showers, with a separate funding effort, then that plan would come before the Commission; it is not part of this plan. Award of grant funding must be through a negotiated process.

Ms. Mester advised that Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) approval would be required for the intermodal funding through the City's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Mr. Lawrence noted that the Commission had already made its recommendation on the CIP to the City Council. Mr. Kearney state that the (350 and 360 South Washington Street) projects are linked; that efforts had been made to link them. Now the Commission is being told that the offsite parking for The Wilden is not linked to the other project. He stated that understanding the financing of the two projects needs to be the City's top priority, but should not delay the necessary construction documents. Ms. Mester agreed that those are options that are not tied to The Wilden project. The off-site parking structure for The Wilden and, potentially, the availability of parking spaces for evenings and weekends is part of the entire proposal.

Mr. Meeks asked if it was reasonable to say that construction of the office building at 360 South Washington Street was tied to the intermodal funding. Mr. Young replied "not one bit". Mr. Meeks asked again and Mr. Young stated that intermodal

funding was one of at least three methods of funding his project. If private funding is not available, then the project might not move forward.

Ms. Teates inquired whether the half parking deck would be built without intermodal funding. Mr. Young replied that it would not be likely, but that there are a number of things that he would like to do.

Ms. Hockenberry expressed her belief that a number of good questions had been raised, but that the Commission needs to keep its eyes on the proposal before it tonight. She advised that this joint proposal has so much potential, but the Commission is only considering a conceptual plan for a Special Exception and the modification of condition four for approval.

In response to Mr. Kearney's inquiry, Ms. Cotellessa advised that the site plan was filed today. The only thing of which she was certain was that the building needed to be completed and occupied by December 21, 2011. Mr. Wilson advised that following site plan approval, the applicant's team anticipates beginning construction in mid-August 2010 and that it will take approximately twelve months to complete construction; that would allow them a four month flexible period for unforeseen events. Mr. Young indicated that his construction schedule, including the parking garage, would take about 12 months for the core and shell. He noted that his plans are not as far along as those for The Wilden.

Ms. Hockenberry inquired if his building was the only one that would be partially underground. Mr. Young replied that his building would only be slightly underground, about one-half floor, but, as in all construction projects, what lies beneath the surface is unknown at this time.

Chair Lawrence opened the item to the public.

- 1. Tom Sawner (1305 North Nelson Street, Arlington, VA), owner of the 360 South Washington Street site and of 500 and 510 Annandale Road, expressed his intent to bring his education company to these buildings for the past two years, but due to changing financial conditions, had not moved forward. He stated that everyone involved needed to move forward from limbo. Mr. Sawner noted that the area had been affected by falling financial dominos. He advised that the 350 South Washington Street building needs the 360 South Washington Street building. Mr. Sawner hopes to work successfully with Mr. Young and had provided a nonbinding letter of intent to lease space in Mr. Young's proposed building. He expressed his opinion that the combined 350 and 360 projects would be good for the City.
- 2. Anna Dworken (108 South Spring Street) advised that she is a member of the City's Human Services Advisory Council (HSAC) and noted that HSAC had held a

discussion on the project proposed, but had not made a recommendation. Many of HSAC's questions had been provided to staff for response, but this project has moved quickly and has changed a number of times.

Hearing no further response, the Chair closed the item to the public.

In response to several questions from Chair Lawrence, Ms. Jackson stated that tax credits are not offered by the VDHA, but are federal tax credits based on laws with strict compliance requirements and, based on an Internal Revenue Service (IRS) ruling, no extensions for the use of funds are permitted. If the tax credits awarded for The Wilden are lost due to noncompliance, then TCB must repay the funds. A negotiated delivery is completed for each tax credit project that includes timing of construction, timing of funding releases, and, if the timelines are not met, then the applicant has to repay the tax credit and has a black mark against them in future requests for tax credit funding. TCB has decided that it would not go forward with the project if they did not find the anticipated risks acceptable. Ms. Jackson stated that the FCHC is walking a tightrope to guarantee that offsite parking will be provided; 38 parking spaces must be available when The Wilden is ready for occupancy. The investors are most concerned about the provision of required offsite parking in a timely manner; the financing of the building through TCB is a separate funding source for the redevelopment of 350 South Washington Street for affordable housing.

Mr. Kearney noted that both properties have a 12 month construction schedule. He inquired whether there was any way to link the concurrent construction projects so that there is no City risk and that the investors are able to minimize their exposure. Ms. Cotellessa explained her understanding that The Wilden team will give funds to Mr. Young to build the 38 offsite parking spaces and the City will give money to TCB, through the FCHC, for the affordable housing project. The projects are tied together contractually. Both projects must be completed; concerns expressed are a matter of control. TCB has full control of the project at 350 South Washington Street while the investors are concerned about the construction timing of the parking structure at 360 South Washington Street. The problem under discussion is being able to give some comfort, or guarantee, to the investors of both projects. The end condition is provision of offsite parking, and TCB is concerned about the timing of the conclusion of each project.

Chair Lawrence thought that the FCHC could have shovels in the ground in June; Mr. Kearney expressed his opinion that FCHC need not start construction first. Ms. Jackson stated that it would be logical, but risky, for FCHC to commence construction first, but that all parties are planning to start in good faith. Chair Lawrence reiterated that the projects appear to be tied together, but the Commission is being told that they are not tied. Ms. Jackson stated that the

investors are concerned about securing 38 offsite parking spaces by the time that The Wilden is ready for occupancy; they are not concerned whether or not the office building is built on 360 South Washington Street.

Ms. Mester concurred with Ms. Cotellessa's comments that the investors are most concerned about the construction timeline for the parking structure being delayed due to financing. Resolution TR10-14, which is before the Commission this evening, guarantees financing for construction of 38 parking spaces for The Wilden at 360 South Washington Street. The project requires full financing before construction may begin. Mr. Young must acquire the parcel before constructing the parking structure and the FCHC's contribution of \$800,000 is insufficient to acquire the 360 South Washington Street property.

Mr. Meeks inquired if it were conceivable to begin constructing The Wilden without Mr. Young closing on the 360 South Washington Street property. Ms. Mester agreed that it could, but not without a financing plan. The City's closing would be concurrent with the VDHA closing. Mr. Meeks noted that Resolution TR10-14 did not state that. Ms. Mester pointed to Line 379 of the Resolution; the land must be acquired. She agreed to weigh the timing of that concept.

Chair Lawrence noted that the Commission's discussion had drifted into the financial aspects of the project and asked Ms. Mester to provide information on Agenda Items 8A and 8B so that the Commission could ask questions on those items before voting on its recommendation to the City Council for the Special Exception.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. (TO10-06) Ordinance Amending Ordinance 1826 To Grant Real Estate Tax Exemption To Falls Church Housing Corporation For The Wilden For The Public Purpose Of Affordable Housing (TO10-06)
- B. (TR10-14) Resolution Amending Resolution 2008-56 Authorizing The City Manager To Execute A "Commitment To Provide Long Term Financing" For The Wilden Affordable Housing Project (TR10-14)

Ms. Mester noted that the Commission had previously discussed the Ordinance to grant a real estate tax exemption to FCHC for The Wilden and the Resolution for the City to provide long term financing for The Wilden at a worksession. She advised that the staff report and the financial spreadsheet have not changed since the worksession. Both staff reports amend documents approved by the City Council in December 2008. Since December 2008, the project proposed has fewer units that would be dedicated for seniors only and the project partner has changed to TCB.

Ms. Mester first provided information on TR10-14, the overarching financing agreement, while TO10-06 was amended to reflect the new project partner. She advised that the total project cost is \$16M, of which the City is granting \$2M through a 15 year interest bearing loan and a tax exemption on the redeveloped property. The funding sources are found on lines 669-681 in the Resolution. The Council approved the waiver of utility connection fees in 2008.

Ms. Mester referred to the spreadsheet provided. She advised that the numbers within parenthesis are positive and reduce the City's cost to provide affordable housing. Ms. Mester reported that the community benefits have been identified previously. The applicant is paying all land use and application fees. The spreadsheet identifies General Fund monies, the total General Fund affordable housing and commercial investment, the transit/public parking funding, and the City's Affordable Housing Trust funding for the project. The subsidy for The Wilden is approximately \$17,000 per unit, the general services cost is less because only senior housing is being provided, and the tax exemption is not effective until the first Certificate of Occupancy (CO) is issued. She reported that the average area subsidy is \$50,000 per unit, but that the per unit cost for The Wilden had been reduced by TCAP funding and the tax exemptions proposed to be granted.

Chair Lawrence inquired whether a tax exemption would be granted for the 360 South Washington Street property because the required parking for 350 South Washington would be on the adjacent parcel. Ms. Mester replied that there would not.

Mr. Meeks asked how affordable housing units are counted when they are contained in a building with market rate units. Ms. Mester replied that the City does not recover the fiscal impact cost on each affordable housing unit in mixed-used developments. Mr. Meeks sought an example of a \$50,000 impact cost per affordable unit in the area. Ms. Mester stated that such an example would be a unit in an Arlington Housing Corporation or in a Wesley Housing development. She advised that the interest rate on the City's loan to the FCHC would be seven percent (7%) as pairing the City's loan funds with the TCAP funds eliminates the ability to provide the loan funds as tax exempt. The total principal and interest cost over the 15 year period would be just over \$3M. The repayment funds will reimburse the City's Affordable Housing Fund; a future City Council will determine where the additional reimbursement funding (the interest) will be allocated.

In response to Chair Lawrence's inquiry, Ms. Mester stated that the interest rate will be determined after the City's bonds are purchased. In response to Ms. Hockenberry's question, Ms. Mester affirmed that the \$532,000 could only be returned to the City's Affordable Housing Fund to be used for future affordable housing opportunities. In response to Mr. Lawrence's question, Ms. Mester stated

that Mr. Sawner had repaid 75% of the funds he owned the City; those funds were returned to the General Fund.

Ms. Rodgers had several questions concerning the Wilden's repayment of debt service. Ms. Mester stated that the Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) will be depleted in approximately three years; future cash contributions for mixed-use projects would replenish the AHF; Council has discussed allocating annual contributions to the AHF from the tax rate; the City's loan for The Wilden will be repaid in full at the end of Year 15; it is likely that The Wilden would likely refinance in Year 16 to achieve sufficient funds to repay the City; the applicant may request an extension for repayment, but that must be approved by the City Council at the time of the request; that the term "66 net new units" is used for this development as the senior affordable housing units provided currently at Winter Hill would not be available for sale prior to 2017; the FCHC is clearly committed to providing affordable housing in that development; and the FCHC opted out of the HUD program as that funding source did not cover the costs of the units; and all current tenants in the Winter Hill affordable units have vouchers which they could transfer to The Wilden units if they desire.

Mr. Wodiska noted that Winter Hill could be refinanced in 2016 and the FCHC could collect those funds. Such an action would leave the City at risk for repayment of the \$2M loan for ten years. Ms. Mester concurred that that was one option, but advised that the FCHC could also use refinancing funds to payback the City earlier than anticipated. Such language for the use of potential Winter Hill refinancing funds was approved by the City Council in 2008.

Ms. Mester distributed proposed text to add to the March 22, 2010 terms expressed in TR10-14, which would begin at Line 306, as follows:

Proceeds from the Sale of Winter Hill Senior Housing Property:

- A) FCHC will adopt by Board Resolution a Letter of Intent to donate a potion from the net sale from the Winter Hill Senior Housing property, consistent with the Cooperative Agreement commitment to the City's Affordable Housing Goals, to the Affordable Housing Trust.
- B) In acceptance of such a voluntary grant, the City will forgive the like amount of the outstanding loan balance from the \$2M fifteen year permanent financing loan.

Ms. Mester indicated that this text amendment had been prepared by the City Attorney and accepted by tax credit attorneys and by the FCHC.

In response to questions from Mr. Wodiska, Chair Lawrence, and Mr. Meeks, the Assistant City Manager stated that the net present value of the loan payment had not been calculated; that the 2016 refinancing might not recover the full \$2M loan amount; that there is no prepayment penalty; and that the City cannot require FCHC to repay the full loan amount if they have the funds to do so, but that it is in the FCHC's best interest to do so. The City's Cooperative Agreement with the FCHC requires FCHC to produce fifty new units every five years; should the Winter Hill affordable units be sold in the future they would not obtain market rates given the small size of those units.

Mr. Meeks suggested that there is a potential for a net loss of affordable housing units; Ms. Mester stated that there is also a risk to lose other affordable housing units over which the City has no control. Mr. Meeks noted that the year 2016 had the potential to be a serious budget buster. Ms. Mester reported that the draft language provided this evening that would permit early repayment of the \$2M loan by the FCHC.

Mr. Lawrence inquired if the FCHC had provided 200 affordable housing units in the City in the last 20 years. Ms. Mester advised that the Cooperative Agreement was renegotiated in 2006; prior to that time the FCHC had no performance measures. Chair Lawrence noted that the FCHC must provide another 50 affordable housing units by 2016. Ms. Mester concurred and noted that it is difficult to provide affordable housing, but that is the FCHC's mission.

Ms. Hockenberry noted that if this project is successful, then the City would be more likely to be approved for future funding for other affordable housing projects. Ms. Mester noted that "new" units could include refurbished housing. She noted that The Fields has a limited low income rent control period.

The Chair opened Items 8A and 8B to the public.

Ira Kaylin (429 Park Avenue) indicated that if he were a member of the FCHC he would never prepay the City's loan is that is a poor business decision; that the investors would incur prepayment penalties; and that the City will lose \$1.4M the day that the loan documents are signed. He stated that the taxpayers are the only ones losing money on the proposal. Mr. Kaylin suggested that the Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) should have loaned the funds so that the City did not carry the risk; apparently the AHF was created to fund projects like the one under consideration. He stated that this is a very complex project for the City's size, is a poor transaction for the City, and requires the City to incur a quarter million dollar cost. He speculated that the AHF was created to keep money off the books, and while it appeared that there was no cost to the City for this project that was not correct.

Hearing no further response, the Chair closed these items to the public.

Ms. Mester reported that the City's AHF was created to stimulate and to leverage affordable housing, just as federal trust funds are used in a similar manner. In response to Ms. Hockenberry's inquiry, Ms. Mester affirmed that the AHF has \$532,000 in real money that is dedicated funding for affordable housing. In response to Ms. Teates's questions, Ms. Mester stated that the AHF's funds are not reported in the City's General Fund, the General Fund transfers funds to the AHF and there is a paper trail. Mr. Meeks asked which accounting method was the better for the fund balance. Ms. Mester stated that tracking funding was cleaner; the debt service is included in the annual budget which affects the fund balance, and would require budgeting for debt service.

In response to additional questions from Ms. Teates and Chair Lawrence, Ms. Mester noted that the City has an Open Space Fund that acts in a similar manner; funds are set aside or dedicated to the Open Space Fund, land is then purchased from the Open Space Fund; that 40 net new affordable housing units had been created in the past ten years; that the FCHC is required to provide fifty net new units every five years; that developers who choose not to include affordable units in their projects must make a contribution to the AHF; and the Zoning Ordinance rewrite will include new language to require the provision of affordable units in multifamily developments. The FCHC must provide net new units every five years, but the City does not dictate how those units are provided. Ms. Hockenberry noted that the majority of the affordable units provided recently were purchased rather than rented; the project proposed would have greatly needed rental units.

Ms. Teates moved, and Ms. Rodgers seconded, to continue the meeting after 10:30 PM. The motion passed on voice vote.

The Commission's discussion returned to Agenda Item 7B, Resolution to Grant A Special Exception for Residential Development Within Mixed Use Projects Under Section 48-90 in a B-2, Central Business District on .64 Acres of Land Located at 350 South Washington Street.

Mr. Meeks sought clarification on how to present a motion for consideration by the Planning Commission. Ms. Cotellessa noted that three sample motions had been provided in the Commission's package: to approve, to approve with conditions, or to deny. The Commission had the ability to modify the suggestion conditions for approval.

MOTION: Mr. Meeks moved, and Ms. Rodgers seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council not adopt TR10-09 REV, a resolution

to grant a Special Exception for residential development of 66 affordable rental residential apartments for seniors at least 62 years of age plus approximately 1,500 square feet of first floor office space and client program, amenity/common space in a B-2, Central Business District, on .64 acres of land (Note that revised parcel after lot line adjustment with 360 South Washington Street and dedication of right-of-way will be approximately .59 acres) located at 350 South Washington Street.

Mr. Meeks indicated his rationale for this motion was his belief that the investors are being treated better than the City in the transactions proposed and that the very best agreement reached would not be in the City's best interest.

### Discussion:

Ms. Hockenberry expressed her belief that there were many positive things to say about the project proposed. She stated that there is no need to kill the application at this level as the complicated financing required may not work. Ms. Hockenberry advised that it did not serve the City well for the Planning Commission to recommend denial so that a super majority approval vote of Council would be required. If this project is not approved, it may cause the City to lose future opportunities.

Mr. Kearney echoed Ms. Hockenberry's sentiment that this is an important project for the City. He advised that he was comfortable with the financial model presented, but was nervous with the current economic condition. Mr. Kearney stated that Mr. Young is the engine of the train; the buildings proposed are scaled appropriately for this project. He supported the redevelopment of this area of the City.

Ms. Teates reported that this has been a back and forth issue for her. Her concerns include the financial burden to the City, the loss of future affordable housing units, the loss of affordable units at Winter Hill, a change in the land use from commercial to mixed-use, and the low Floor Area Ratios (FAR). However, once she saw the design for the 360 South Washington Street building she believed that the design was more vibrant and the City would have a portion of the South Washington Street streetscape provided. Ms. Teates noted that patrons of the new restaurant in the Tax Analyst building and other visitors to the area would see new construction that is attractive and vibrant. She expressed her desire to see some public parking at 360 South Washington Street, along with a bus stop, and hoped that the City would be successful in obtaining intermodal funding. Ms. Teates advised that the key to her decision was Mr. Sawner's statement this evening that he is ready to work with Mr. Young and to redevelop 500 and 510 South Washington Street. She expressed her willingness to take a leap of faith after seeing the potential catalyst that these projects could provide.

Mr. Wodiska advised that he, too, had waffled constantly on the proposal. He stated that he is a big affordable housing proponent. Mr. Wodiska expressed appreciation for the recent efforts to make this a more viable proposal and for the answers to Commissioners's questions. He was concerned about the net loss of affordable housing units at Winter Hill in the next five years. Mr. Wodiska was also concerned about putting all of the City's eggs in one basket. The remaining unknowns revolve around the 360 South Washington Street proposal; these issues must be finalized and resolved soon as the timeline is so short for the affordable housing project. He stated that he did not support the motion.

Mr. Meeks suggested that he shared the same concerns, but did not know how to sort them out. Ms. Teates suggested that the Commission could use the sample motion to approve with conditions. Mr. Wodiska advised that many modifications were needed to make it approvable; both "short-term" and "financing" terms needed greater clarification. In response to Chair Lawrence's inquiry, Mr. Wodiska stated that the motion to approve should include the proposed text discussed this evening, including condition four, among other modifications to tie the two projects together as closely as possible. Chair Lawrence stated that if the Commission recommended approval with conditions, then the Council could ignore those conditions. However, if the Commission recommended denial, then the Council could ignore the Commission's suggestions by a majority vote. He noted that the Commission's record of getting changes accepted on a majority vote were not very good. Mr. Lawrence suggested that the Commission recommend denial because it wanted to see certain approval conditions. Ms. Hockenberry disagreed strongly.

Ms. Rodgers agreed with Mr. Lawrence and stated that the Commission never has a chance to negotiate on Special Exceptions and that this proposal has not been fully fleshed out; there are too many variables. She expressed that the City may not have the firm deadlines that had been expressed previously. Ms. Mester noted that building permits for The Wilden would be required by June 30.

Ms. Cotellessa stated that the related site plan must be approved prior to issuance of any building permits. She reiterated that the proposal before the Commission this evening is a Special Exception for a mixed-use project with its appurtenant parking; the Commission is also considering a long-term financing package for the project. Ms. Cotellessa expressed her belief that the City Council is looking toward the Planning Commission to identify outstanding issues by providing constructive comments on a land use plan and on issues that remain unresolved. She suggested that the Commission tie the loan terms to the long-term financing Resolution to help the Council achieve the result that the Commission desires.

Ms. Hockenberry opposed a negative recommendation and supported a positive motion with strong constructive comments. Ms. Rodgers stated that if the Commission included a deal breaker in its comments, then its recommendation would be ignored. She supported another motion. Ms. Hockenberry expressed support for a recommendation that included some wiggle room; it was unrealistic to require that all construction must be completed by December 31, 2011. TCB knows that they must meet the construction schedule, but they do not control the construction of the parking structure. Likewise, the investors indicate that they cannot support the motion proposed without a safety valve for unforeseen conditions.

Mr. Meeks expressed satisfaction with condition four, but has heard that the Commission had been requested to remove it. Ms. Hockenberry noted that both the applicant and Ms. Cotellessa had suggested modifying that condition. Mr. Meeks suggested that the approval conditions should be tied to the financing documents.

Ms. Rodgers expressed her discomfort with drafting motions from the podium as there was not an opportunity to review the language or to consider the ramifications. Chair Lawrence reiterated his support for a motion to deny with the Commission's rationale for that vote. He stated that the Planning Commission had a history of recommending approval with conditions, but having Council ignoring the recommended conditions in its approval. Therefore, the Commission needed to work with what it had.

The Assistant City Manager reported on her side discussion with the applicant team. The applicant sought not to delete condition four entirely, but to modify it.

Mr. Meeks inquired if the applicant would define short term as 30 days; they responded "no". He inquired if the applicant would define it as 60 days; they again responded "no". Mr. Lasso stated that the Commission missed the point; the applicants do not know how long, if at all, temporary off-site parking might be required. Such a modification would provide the investors a safety valve and would allow Council to approve the Special Exception. Should the safety valve be required, the applicant team would return to negotiate with the City for the terms of that temporary arrangement.

Ms. Hockenberry noted that there are two timing issues that could shut down the project: condition four in the Commission's recommendation; and Mr. Young providing off-site parking. Ms. Teates noted that the staff recommended conditions of approval were supported by Council. The Commission relies upon staff to convey the Commission's thoughts to Council. Additionally, Commissioners have an opportunity to write letters to Council expressing their positions.

Ms. Rodgers called for the question. Mr. Kearney stated agreed with Ms. Teates and expressed his opinion that the Commission did not need to strong arm the City Council.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 3-4 (Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Meeks, and Ms. Rodgers voted "yes"; Ms. Hockenberry, Mr. Kearney, Ms. Teates, and Mr. Wodiska voted "no".)

Ms. Cotellessa suggested that the Commission's recommendation add any conditions which it believed would make a better project. Mr. Kearney recommended modifying proposed condition two by including the date for the preliminary site plan and the date for the architectural renderings provided this evening. Ms. Hockenberry suggested a motion, afterwhich Mr. Kearney inquired if Ms. Hockenberry's intent was to have Council grant Certificates of Occupancy. She replied that she did not.

Commissioners discussed the conditions to be proposed. Mr. Lasso reiterated his comments concerning the Planning Commission recommending a safety valve for temporary offsite parking for The Wilden, if necessary. Commissioners and Ms. Cotellessa discussed the usual approval process for site plans, attempted to define "short-term", and edited condition four.

MOTION: Ms. Hockenberry moved, and Ms. Rodgers seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt TR10-09 REV, a Resolution to Grant a Special Exception for Residential Development of 66 Affordable Rental Residential Apartments for Seniors at Least 62 Years of Age Plus Approximately 1,500 Square Feet of First Floor Office Space and Client Program, Amenity/Common Space in a B-2, Central Business District on .64 Acres of Land (Note that Revised Parcel After Lot Line Adjustment with 360 South Washington Street and Dedication of Right-Of-Way will be Approximately .59 Acres) Located at 350 South Washington Street, with the following conditions:

- 1. That the Developers' Voluntary Concessions, Terms and Conditions for "The Wilden" dated November 20, 2009 is incorporated herein by reference and marked as Exhibit No. 1 (modifying the minimum 1800 square feet of commercial office space to be a minimum of 1500 square feet of commercial office space); all the terms and conditions thereof shall be a condition for the issuance and approval of the Special Exception; and the City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Developer's Voluntary Concessions, Terms and Conditions on behalf of the City.
- 2. The project shall be developed in substantial conformance with the applicant's final preliminary site plan dated March 4, 2010, as modified by architectural renderings dated March 15, 2010, which includes a lot line adjustment with and

- provision of structured parking off-site on the adjacent property at 360 South Washington Street.
- 3. The applicant shall request a reduction in the required parking at site plan subject to Planning Commission approval and in no case provide less than .5 spaces per senior affordable dwelling unit nor less than one space per three hundred square feet of the minimum 1500 square feet of leaseable office space.
- 4. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for any portion of The Wilden project at 350 South Washington Street until the structured parking appurtenant thereto and all pedestrian and vehicular accesses to it are completed, elevators are operational, and final inspections have been conducted on the structured parking at 360 South Washington Street. If the structured parking is not qualified for a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) at the time The Wilden building and site are qualified for a CO, that the Council craft language to allow for temporary, shortterm, off-site parking.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed 5-2 (Ms. Hockenberry, Mr. Kearney, Ms. Rodgers, Ms. Teates, and Mr. Wodiska voted "yes"; Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Meeks voted "no").

# 8. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. (TO10-06) Ordinance Amending Ordinance 1826 To Grant Real Estate Tax Exemption To Falls Church Housing Corporation For The Wilden For The Public Purpose Of Affordable Housing (TO10-06)
- B. (TR10-14) Resolution Amending Resolution 2008-56 Authorizing The City Manager To Execute A "Commitment To Provide Long Term Financing" For The Wilden Affordable Housing Project (TR10-14)

Ms. Cotellessa noted that the City Council had referred these two items to certain boards and commissions and the Planning Commission may choose to make a recommendation on either or both. Ms. Mester noted that State Code requires that tax exemptions be granted by ordinance.

Mr. Meeks inquired whether a no default provision was included in the event that The Wilden was not built. Ms. Mester replied that there was not. Mr. Meeks asked if the text contained an affirmative requirement for the off-site parking to be built. Ms. Mester responded that the release of City funds for the project is tied to language in the loan documents. Commissioners agreed that the City's intent is included within the text of the Ordinance and of the Resolution, but that the text needs to be tighter. Ms. Hockenberry suggested that the draft language distributed by Ms. Mester this evening be included. That text is "Proceeds from the Sale of Winter Hill Senior Housing Property: A) FCHC will adopt by Board Resolution a

Letter of Intent to donate a potion from the net sale from the Winter Hill Senior Housing property, consistent with the Cooperative Agreement commitment to the City's Affordable Housing Goals, to the Affordable Housing Trust, and B) In acceptance of such a voluntary grant, the City will forgive the like amount of the outstanding loan balance from the \$2m fifteen year permanent financing loan."

Ms. Cotellessa advised that both the site plan and the subdivision approvals are required, which grants the City some control. Commissioners supported obtaining more affordable dwelling units rather than cash contributions from future developments; expressed its desire that the Falls Church Housing Corporation repay the City's loan funds as soon as possible; and that large partial payments could be made earlier than required by the loan terms. Ms. Mester stated that the terms had been reviewed by the City Attorney and by the applicant; if the terms were to be tighter, then an additional review would be required. In response to Mr. Kearney's inquiry, Ms. Mester promised to provide the Commission with a summary of the proforma for a repayment schedule.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. (TO10-03REV) Ordinance To Amend Chapter 48, Zoning, Of The Code Of The City Of Falls Church, Virginia, By Adding A New Section 48-455(3), Special Exceptions In The B-1, Limited Business District; Section 48-488(4), Special Exceptions In The B-2, Central Business District; And Section 48-523(3), Special Exceptions In The B-3, General Business District Uses; In Order To Allow By Special Exception, With Approval Criteria, Modifications To The Off-Street Parking And Loading Requirements

Ms. Rodgers reported that she had been unable to attend the last Zoning Ordinance Advisory Committee (ZOAC) meeting and inquired if this Ordinance had been discussed at that meeting. Ms. Cotellessa replied that it had not; the general discussion noted that there are not many changes proposed except for maximum occupancy. She stated that the consultant had provided language, as well as language for an administrative review.

Chair Lawrence thanked Mr. Kearney for his detailed comments that had been provided earlier. Ms. Cotellessa advised that City Council had scheduled Second Reading for this Ordinance on Monday, March 22. However, the Commission may request that Council defer this item to allow an opportunity for a worksession during which the Commission could share its thoughts.

MOTION: Mr. Meeks moved, and Ms. Hockenberry seconded, that the Commission request the City Council to defer Second Reading on this item to permit time to hold

a joint worksession during which the Commission could share its thoughts and to recommend substitute language for the Zoning Ordinance text amendment.

The motion passed on voice vote.

- 9. OTHER BUSINESS: None.
- 10. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u>: The Minutes of March 1, 2010 were approved as presented.
- 11. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at Midnight.

Respectfully Submitted:

Noted and Approved:

Debra L. Gee Recording Secretary Suzanne M. Cotellessa General Manager of Development Services and Planning Director

The City of Falls Church is committed to the letter and to the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act. To request reasonable accommodation for any type of disability call 703.248.5040 (TTY 711).